

LEONARD R. PALMER

*Arya-*  
A Homological Sketch<sup>1</sup>

The problem of the name of the "Aryans" has never ceased to fascinate and exercise Indo-Europeanists. In a recent discussion E. Benveniste<sup>2</sup> dismisses P. Thieme's proposal<sup>3</sup> that *arya-* meant 'hospitable' and puts forward the tentative suggestion that "les *ari* forment l'autre moitié d'une société exogamique". Undoubtedly Benveniste is right to insist that the *ari-* is not a foreigner. But what is surprising is his neglect of the fundamental etymological principle on which he rightly and consistently insists: "La condition primordiale d'une étymologie rigoureuse . . . c'est l'établissement du sens initial."<sup>4</sup> Here the evidence of Iranian is vital and conclusive. Yet Benveniste remarks (p. 370) that *Arya-* in Iranian is an isolated word: "un mot inanalysable servant seulement à nommer ceux qui relèvent d'une même appartenance ethnique". This statement is comprehensible only if we suppose that the lecture which has been incorporated in the book<sup>5</sup> antedates H. W. Bailey's searching study<sup>6</sup> of the abundant Iranian evidence with its "rich development of noun and verb".

Bailey's detailed analyses substantiate the conclusion that there is a full complement of verbal and nominal forms traceable to an Iranian base *ar-* 'to get'. This meaning can also be traced in Old Indian, where examples are found of *arya-* 'owner, possessor of wealth', in which Bailey sees "a direct derivative with *-ya-* of agent from *ar-* 'to get'. *ari-* 'owner' occurs in the same sense as *arya-*. Particularly attractive is the analysis of *aryamán-* (Av. *airyaman*) as 'the warden and dispenser of possessions . . .'. Bailey analyses it as a compound of *arya-* 'wealth' and *man-* 'think' in the special sense 'take thought for, care for, act as warden'. He comments that though these uses of Old Indian *ārya-*, *aryá-* and *aryá* have been widely discussed from the beginning of "Aryan" studies, in most of these studies the Iranian evidence is hardly touched upon. His general conclusion is that "all these Iranian and Old Indian words fit effortlessly into a consistent system by recognition of a base *ar-* 'to get' and its variant 'possess, own'. Bailey, in view of the 'noble' connotations of the word *arya-* and the stress on good birth, believes that while "the meaning of *arya-* as 'wealth' and 'owner' is suitable to name a rich class . . . it is too narrow to serve for an idealistic programmatic ethnic name". Consequently he would derive *arya-* from the root *ar-* in the special sense 'to beget'. This solution, while attractive within Iranian, neglects the undoubted congeners

<sup>1</sup> This study is published as a 'sketch' because twenty years of desultory research into the terminology of land-tenure have convinced me that a life-time is not long enough for its completion.

<sup>2</sup> Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes, 1969, I 368ff.

<sup>3</sup> Der Fremdling im Rgveda, 1938.

<sup>4</sup> Les Mages, 20.

<sup>5</sup> See the Avant-propos to the book pp. 12f.

<sup>6</sup> Iranian *Arya-* and *Daha-*, Transactions of the Philological Society 1959 (1960), 71—115.

in other branches of Indo-European, such as Greek ἄριστος, ἀρεῖων, Irish *aire*, etc., quoted by Bailey himself (p. 99). Perhaps there is no need to set up a hypothetical 'World' framework of an "idealistic programme". New insight will come perhaps from the introduction into etymological work of the concept of 'homology'.

This term and concept I borrow from the biologists and use it like them as a structural term with possible genetic implications. Two or more terms constitute an homology when they exhibit semantic similarities and occur in a particular site of a semantic structure. A simple example will serve to illustrate what is meant. In the structure of English terms for military ranks between *major* and *lieutenant* we find *captain*. In German in the same 'site' we find *Hauptmann*. Both terms are derived from words meaning 'head'. The similar semantic content of the two terms we can symbolize by the use of capitals HEADMAN: HEADMAN. Now the development of a word 'head' to the meaning 'chief' is so easy and natural that no conclusion about 'genetic' or 'historical' relationship could be drawn from such resemblances. What introduces the factor of 'arbitrariness', on which all etymologies must be based, is the 'siting' of the resemblant terms at an identical and peculiar place in the semantic structure. It is not obvious and self-evident that so comparatively junior an officer should be called in both systems a HEADMAN. It is such a structurally sited semantic parallel that we propose to call an 'homology'. The theoretical question of what kinds of homology justify 'genetic' or 'historical' conclusions will be discussed below.

One of the most striking examples of homology in Indo-European is observable in the structure of land-tenure terms. Even before the decipherment of the Linear B script in 1952 the Greek word δῆμος, which had the additional interest of being used not only with reference to land but also to the corresponding social class opposed to the warrior class, with its derivation from the root \*dāi- 'divide', 'distribute',<sup>7</sup> was evidently homological with the Welsh term *rhandiroedd* 'sharelands' and the corresponding Old English word *gedalland*.<sup>8</sup> The Welsh 'sharelands' were held by joint tenants who were members of a co-operative kin-group: "... arable at least was made up of scattered strips (*tir gwasgar*) which lay intermingled with those of other clansmen in sharelands (*rhandiroedd*, singular *rhandir*) ...".<sup>9</sup> Of particular interest is the more servile tenure whereby each tenant held equal shares in the arable land of the township. As for these bondsmen, they were evidently the earlier settlers: "Presumably the bond communities included the descendants of prehistoric settlers and perhaps of the Goedelic Celts of the early historic period, who were perhaps enslaved by subsequent invaders who appear to have been Brythonic Celts."<sup>10</sup>

In Scotland the corresponding term is *runrig* while in Ireland the word *rundale* is used. This may be attractively explained as a hybrid Anglo-Celtic compound of the type *Penhill* or the Old English place-name *Crycheorh*, modern *Creechbarrow*, a combination of *crūc* 'hill' with the English synonym. The first element represents

<sup>7</sup> Frisk GEW and Chantraine DELG sub voc.

<sup>8</sup> On the terms *rhandiroedd* and *gedalland* see now most conveniently The Agrarian History of England and Wales (ed. F. P. R. Finberg), 1972, references in Index sub voc. 'Shareland'.

<sup>9</sup> G. R. J. Jones, Some Medieval Rural Settlements in North Wales. The Institute of British Geographers, Transactions and Papers, Publication No. 19, 1953, p. 55.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 71.

Celtic *ran*<sup>11</sup>; the second component of *rundale* is, of course, the noun corresponding to Germ. *Teil*, which gives the corresponding OE word for the 'shareland', *gedalland*. We find similar expressions in Scandinavia, particularly significant being the Swedish term *fornskifte*, literally 'old-time partition'.<sup>12</sup> Among students of the question the institution of the 'sharelands' is considered to be of high antiquity: "The Welsh evidence strongly suggests that the openfields and clustered settlements originated in prehistoric times amongst mixed-arable farmers who later became the bondmen of pastoral overlords."<sup>13</sup>

So much for the state of the question of the 'shareland' before the decipherment of Linear B. In the Mycenaean texts it turned out that the Greek term δῆμος, already appearing as a homology of *rhandir* in its basic meaning 'shareland', occurred at a particular site of a coherent structure. This reinforced the impression that we were dealing with a phenomenon "of high antiquity". By 'structure' is meant, of course, a set of terms with 'oppositional' relations. In the Pylos texts the relations are particularly complex<sup>14</sup>, and indeed multidimensional. We have two parallel sets of terms in which type of tenure is correlated with type of occupant:

<i>temenos</i>	<i>wanax</i>
<i>temenos</i>	<i>lāwagetās</i>
<i>kitimenā kotonā</i>	<i>telestās</i>
<i>kekemenā kotonā</i>	<i>dāmos</i>

We first focus on the *kekemenā* land correlated with the *dāmos*. Here the information already available about the 'shareland' and the favoured etymology of δῆμος tilted the balance in favour of a harmonious solution of the problem offered by the new term *kekemenā*. The participle, in view of its evident meaning, pointed to a connexion with the Greek adjective κοινός 'common', and the resulting root \*kei- linked up with words meaning 'split', which gave a satisfactory sense 'shared' to κοινός, as in the phrase κοινὰ τὰ φίλων 'the property of friends is shared'. This purely internal Greek solution had a number of repercussions in other Indo-European languages, for the root \*kei- underlies a whole host of words belonging to the sociological vocabulary such as Germanic *haims*, Latin *civis*, etc.<sup>15</sup> which cannot reasonably be derived from the root \*kei- 'lie'. This has most recently been expressed by P. Chantraine (DELG sub voc. κῶμη): "Mais le rapprochement souvent répété avec κῆμαι n'a pas grand sens ...", and he inclines towards the solution recalled here. See also the same author sub voc. κῶμος.

The point is of such nuclear importance to our thesis that a discussion of an alternative suggestion will be advisable in order to lay bare some fundamental principles of etymological research. C. J. Ruijgh<sup>16</sup> rules out the solution *kekeiménā* (instead of

<sup>11</sup> Ir. *rann* 'part', Welsh *rhan* < \*přsnā (cf. Lat. *pars*): see Pedersen, Vergl. Gram. d. kelt. Spr. II, 52. Goidelic *rann* has been detected in the place-name *Ravenglass* 'Glas's share'.

<sup>12</sup> L. Musset, Les peuples scandinaves au moyen âge, 1951, 87f.

<sup>13</sup> E. Estyn Evans, The Ecology of Peasant Life in Western Europe (Background Paper No. 16 prepared for the Wenner-Gren Foundation International Symposium "Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth", Princeton Inn, Princeton, N. J. June 16-22, 1955), p. 26.

<sup>14</sup> See my Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts, 186ff.

<sup>15</sup> See Mycenaean Greek Texts from Pylos, Transactions of the Philological Society 1954 (1955), 24ff.

<sup>16</sup> Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien, 1967, 364f.



the expected zero grade) for such early texts as the Mycenaean. But the argument "too early for analogy" is hardly cogent. Analogical forces may and must be ascribed to all periods of human speech. It hardly seems preferable to invent a Greek root *khē-* and to endow it with the meaning 'leave, abandon' on the base of OInd. *jāhāti*: and then to impose on this the special significance 'leave uncultivated' all the more so because we happen to know the Mycenaean word for this: it is *āktitos* (PY Na 926). Two fundamental points may be made: (1) Ruijgh's suggestion offends against the basic principle of etymological research 'Look for Latin etymologies on the Tiber', whereas the connexion with *κοινός*, etc. obeys the rule; (2) no 'verification' is offered. Where in the world is land of the lower order described as 'abandoned land'? Here, too, our suggestion, emerging from the first procedure, finds numerous echoes which had already been diagnosed as "of high antiquity". Moreover, we have a harmonious explanation of the whole phrase *kekemena kotona paro damo*. The impression that the 'common land' of the lower order is extremely ancient is reinforced by the Hittite term *takšannaš*; for this is the genitive case of the abstract noun *takšatar* from the root *takš-* on which F. Sommer comments<sup>17</sup>: "Positiv jedoch kennen die alten Belege von *takš-* sonst durchaus wie die späteren nur den Sinn 'zuteil werden lassen, zuweisen, zufügen'." Whether we translate *takšannaš* as 'distributed land' or 'community land', we evidently have to do with a notion not too far removed from what has been studied in the preceding pages.

The *kekemena* land, as we saw, is opposed in the texts to the *kitimena* land, the corresponding occupants being dubbed *tereta*. This is now with general consent interpreted as *telestās*, a derivative from *τέλος*, the literal meaning of which is 'what is lifted, a burden'. That the *telestai* have *wanax* connexions is evident from the texts, and we may detect a further homology in the idiom according to which the Hittite 'Man of the Service' conceived of his duty to the king as a burden to be lifted or cast down. Once again we have a clear echo in the Germanic world, where *baro* had already been long diagnosed as 'the man of the burden'<sup>18</sup>.

The Linear B texts also brought the *wanax* and the *lāwagetās* into connexion with the tenurial term *temenos*, literally 'cut', the semantic parallels for which will occupy us below. But what was the tenurial term corresponding to the 'nobles'? Here the texts are silent since they record matters which were under palace control, and the grandees who appear in various guises, e. g. as owners of cattle and slaves, are more likely to be the *egeta*, the 'Companions' of the king, who figure almost exclusively in religious contexts. To fill the gap we may turn to the Greek terms for the 'nobles', *ἄριστοι* and *ἀρείων*.

The weak point in Bailey's solution, as we saw, was that in Greek and other languages the root *ar-* means 'acquire', just as it does in Indo-Iranian, and there is no evidence there for the sense 'beget'. Now the comparative form *ἀρείων* 'superior (in birth, warrior virtues, fortune, etc.)' presents a morphological problem. The suggestion which enjoys the greatest favour is that of H. Seiler<sup>19</sup>, who regards it as an adaptation of the positive adjective *ἄρειος*, which in its turn derives easily from the neuter *s*-stem *ἄρος*. The sense which it will have had as a derivative from the root *ar-* 'acquire' will have been 'acquisition, property', and we may add, following Chantraine (DELG sub voc. *ἀρνευμαι*), 'obtenir, gagner, recevoir' avec comme

<sup>17</sup> HAB 145.

<sup>18</sup> See Interpretation, 190ff. with reference to the earlier paper Trans. Philol. Soc., 1954 (1955).

<sup>19</sup> Steigerungsformen, 116f.

objet, gloire, récompense, rémunération . . . avec notion accessoire d'effort". Chantraine enumerates the traits which point to archaic character of the verb and its group. Within a warrior society such a possession gained by effort will have been largely the reward of military exploits, and the transition from 'property' to *beneficium*<sup>20</sup> is easily understood.

This straightforward analysis of the Greek words now brings us face to face with the same problem as faced Bailey in Indo-Iranian. The semantic core of the term for 'noble' is the notion of 'property': the nobleman is 'the man of the property'. Once the etymological problem in both these language groups is formulated in this way, a Germanic homology immediately presents itself. This is the German word *Adel*, which belongs to an extensive family of Germanic words traceable to Gmc. *\*apala-/ōpala-*, with an adjectival form *\*apalya-* and a noun *\*apaling*<sup>21</sup>. The problem is mainly a semantic one. In a famous paper<sup>22</sup> G. Neckel argued that at an early date compounds and derivatives show that there was a word *apal* which denoted a hereditary landed property which had no necessary 'noble' connotations. Now in the old Norwegian laws the word has the following meaning<sup>23</sup>: it denotes inherited landed property which the owner is not allowed to alienate unless he has first offered it to all the members of the family (clan); if he does, the members of the family, following a certain sequence of priority, are entitled to claim it. Ownership of an *ōpal* was recognized by law if continued possession for four generations was established. The possession of such a property certainly had class connotations: the *wergeld* of the possessor of an *ōpal* (the *höldr*) was double that of a simple peasant, but only a half or a quarter of that of the chiefs. It has been said of the *höldr*: "L'inaliénabilité pratique de sa terre lui interdit de tomber jamais dans un état dépendant; il constitue l'assise de la Norvège ancienne."<sup>24</sup>

The notion of *hereditary* landed property, while clearly attributable to early Norse society, may have been a special development of a more neutral meaning 'landed property'. This was argued by O. Behaghel<sup>25</sup>: "Nordische Gelehrte sind mit Entschiedenheit dafür eingetreten, daß nur 'Grundeigentum' die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von Odal sei, also 'Stammgut' erst in nordischer Entwicklung daraus abgeleitet." This less precise meaning is supported by the fact that in Gothic Greek *ἄγροῦς* is translated as *haimoplja*<sup>26</sup>. Moreover, as Behaghel pointed out, in OE *æpel* alternates with *ham*: "... was an einer Stelle *æpel* bezeichnet ist, wird an der anderen durch *ham* ausgedrückt". We may add that the concept of 'Landbesitz' is expressed by the compound *edelriht*. In OE *ōpel*, *æpel*, *eþel* covers the semantic range 'residence or property, inheritance, country, realm, land, dwelling, home'.

O. Szemerényi, too, has dismissed<sup>27</sup> Neckel's thesis that the *adal* was an 'Erbgut' in origin. But this difference of opinion has fortunately little relevance to our theme. Certain is it that the semantic range covered by this word-family includes 'landed property' and it is also abundantly clear that the possession of an *ōpal* involved a distinction of social class. This, as we have seen, was certainly the case in ancient

<sup>20</sup> *ἄρος* is glossed as *ἔφελος* in Hesychius.

<sup>21</sup> See O. Szemerényi, The Etymology of German *ADEL*, Word 8, 1952, 43.

<sup>22</sup> *Adel und Gefolgschaft*, PBB 41, 1916, 385-436.

<sup>23</sup> My attention was drawn to this evidence by Professor Andreas Holmsen.

<sup>24</sup> L. Musset, Les peuples scandinaves au moyen âge, 1951, 97.

<sup>25</sup> Odal. Sitzber. Bayr. Ak., Phil.-hist. Kl., 1935, Hft. 8, 22.

<sup>26</sup> See S. Feist, Vergl. Wtb. d. got. Spr., sub voc.

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit. p. 45.

Norway, and the 'noble' implications are unmistakable in OE *æþelo*, *æþele*, *æþeling*<sup>28</sup>, and this has become dominant in German *Adel*. While there is much to be said for the view that 'landed property' was the primary meaning and that it was in the marginal areas that the oldest state of affairs survived (see above on the 'share-lands'), we may, in the first instance content ourselves simply with an objective plotting of the semantic range 'landed property'/'nobility' attaching to this word-family, which is not in dispute. But with this unexceptional formulation we hit upon an evident homology with the *ar*- group of both Greek and Indo-Iranian, and there the primary meaning 'acquire, possess' is hardly open to doubt. This is encouragement to the belief that this notion is also to be preferred as the semantic nucleus of the *Adel*-family. If then there are cogent grounds for regarding 'landed property' as the primary meaning of the *Adel*-family, this has implications for the etymology<sup>29</sup>.

It is a striking fact that a large number of land-tenure terms are derived from verbs meaning 'cut', 'split' and the like. Elsewhere<sup>30</sup> I have drawn attention to Greek τέμενος, Latin *castrum*, and Hittite *kweras*, the last linking up with the Lycian word for a 'body of men, German *Schar*' (*terñ*) and also an adverb, a fossilized noun case (*tern*) meaning 'outside, apart from'. Pedersen<sup>31</sup>, translating the adverb by the Greek χωρίς, diagnosed a basic notion 'separation'. As we have just seen, in a military application the derived noun would have originally meant something like the German *Schar*; and with application to a field this was something 'separated off', 'ein abgegrenztes Feldstück'.

In an earlier study<sup>32</sup> it was pointed out that the Greek χωρίς, used by Pedersen to translate *tern*, with its derived verb χωρίζω 'divide, separate', links up with the noun χῶρος, and this leads us back again into the technical vocabulary of land-tenure. In one of the earliest examples (Il. 12, 421 ff.) it is used in connexion with

<sup>28</sup> Note particularly the comment of Marc Bloch, *La Société féodale: les classes et le gouvernement des hommes*, 1949, p. 3: "Par une restriction de sens hautement significative, en Angleterre, depuis le IX<sup>e</sup> ou le X<sup>e</sup> siècles, seules les proches du roi conserve le droit au nom d'*aetheling*."

<sup>29</sup> See below for other suggestions.

<sup>30</sup> Interpretation, 187 ff. with earlier references.

<sup>31</sup> Lykisch, 48 f.

<sup>32</sup> See Μνήμης χάριν, Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer II, 69 ff. on Il. 12, 421 ff. Note also that the word ἴση itself connects up with the root *\*widh-* which appears in Latin *dividō*. Ernout—Meillet I, 317 quote P. F. 62, 1 to show that *castella* has replaced an earlier term *dividicula*. Umbrian offers the imperative vetu "dividito" and the noun *uef* (accus. pl.) "partis", both testifying to a root *\*weidh-*. The opposition of the zero grade in Latin *-vidō* to the Umbrian full grade points to an old athematic present. The semantic range of Old Indian is interesting in the present connexion: *vidhyati* 'he pierces', *vindhāte* 'he lacks'. It is the latter sense which attaches *vidua* 'widow' to the same family (see below on χήρα and ὄρφανος). In the Homeric passage ἴση evidently means 'share', 'plot of land' and not 'equal share'. I have already drawn attention to the proper name Ἀγχίσις, which means literally 'he who has his ἴση close at hand', 'neigh-bour' (OE *nēahgebūr*, OHG *nāhgibūr*, etc.). Frisk (GEW I, 738), while approving of an ancestral form *\*Futσ-Foc*, can offer no semantic solution. Chantraine (DELG, 470), for his part, also admits the same phonological-morphological *Urform* and refers to an ingenious suggestion by Meillet, who would derive the noun from (*dwi-* 'two'). Our own suggestion *\*Futσ-Foc* from the root *\*weidh-/widh-* has the advantage of linking up with a widespread family of words with a semantic range for which there are numerous parallels.

disputed 'shares' (ἴση) in a small plot (ὀλιγὸν ἐνὶ χώρῳ) in a common ploughland (ἐπιζύοντες ἐν ἀρούρη). It is this root again which provides us with a compound the "high antiquity" of which is not in doubt. It is of particular interest because it provides us with a noun where the notion of 'inheritance' is unmistakable. This is the word χηρῶσται 'the remoter heirs who succeed to the property of one who dies without heirs'. The first element χηρο- undoubtedly is a noun referring to the 'inheritance' while the second is attractively linked up with OInd. *ā-dā* 'to take, receive'. The great antiquity of the term is shown by the Latin correspondent *hērēd-*, apropos of which Meillet, by way of parallel for the curious semantic scatter 'heritage — deprived' (as in Greek χήρᾱ etc.) quotes Irish *orbe*, Gothic *arbi* as against 'deprived' sense predominant in Latin *orbus*, Greek ὄρφανος<sup>33</sup>. If we follow up this idea, we may posit a semantic evolution from the notion 'separate, divide, cut off' to 'hereditament', 'real property'. This would make attractive a connexion with Hittite *harp-*, which is credited with the meanings 'auseinander machen, trennen, dislozieren, distribuere; Med. sich losmachen, sich trennen, scheiden', which is much like English 'shear, share, sheer off' and yields a semantic range similar to that detected in the *\*ghēr-/ghōr*-family.

If all this encourages us to expect a verb from the same semantic sphere<sup>34</sup> as a congener of *ōpala/apala*, then we might see in it a *l*-derivative from the root represented by Hittite *hattāi-*, for which J. Friedrich registers 'hauen, (ab)schneiden, (nieder)schlagen', which is corrected by A. Goetze to 'aufschlitzen' (nicht 'hauen')<sup>35</sup>. We may now return to *ar*- 'property' and approve a connexion with the Hittite *har-/hark-*<sup>36</sup>. It should be stressed, however, that the acceptance or rejection of the proposed etymological connexions does not affect the essence of the present study, which is basically concerned with establishing the semantic range of the *ari/arya*-family of Indo-Iranian by the close analysis of texts and with searching for homologies established by similar 'philological' work in other language groups. We return from these homological explorations additionally receptive to the thesis that *arya*- meant 'a man of the *ari*-' in the sense of a piece of landed property which was a mark of social class. But such a class term is essentially 'oppositive'. That is, it implies some other class or classes from which it is distinguished by such a mode of land-tenure.

Now attention has been called<sup>37</sup> to the fact that *ari*- has contextual connexions with another Old Indian class term: "... les *ari* sont souvent associés aux *vaiśya*, c'est-à-dire aux membres de la troisième classe sociale, ce qui confirme que l'*ari* n'est pas un étranger". This association with the third social class, suggesting as it does an opposition, is a precious piece of information which strengthens the belief that *ari*-, *arya*- was once the designation of the social class of the warrior nobility with their characteristic landed property contrasting with the third order, who

<sup>33</sup> The three 'cut' words have 'deprived' elements in their semantic range: χήρᾱ (*\*ghēr-*), ὄρφανος (*\*H<sub>3</sub>erbh-*), *vidua* etc. (*\*weidh-/widh-*).

<sup>34</sup> Seeing that the establishment of the 'sens initial' is the primary step in any etymological proposal, our positing of 'property' as the primary sense renders unnecessary any discussion of suggestions which rest on a different foundation (e. g. O. Szemerényi op. cit. note 21); see also C. Moussy in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à Pierre Chantraine*, pp. 157 ff.

<sup>35</sup> Hethitisches Wörterbuch, 2. Ergänzungsheft, 12.

<sup>36</sup> O. Szemerényi, KZ 73, 183, a proposal discussed by Bailey op. cit. 93.

<sup>37</sup> E. Benveniste, *Vocabulaire I*, 372.



were 'men of the *viś*'. The insertion of *arya-* into this site of the structure of social vocabulary enables us to carry out a confirmatory test. Once *arya-* had undergone a natural semantic development and had come to be used as an ethnic, doubtless already in Indo-Iranian times, it left a gap in the terminology of the social classes. What word replaced it? This question focuses attention and new light on the term *kṣatrām*, which in the Veda contrasts with the *viś* as the label for the warrior aristocracy<sup>38</sup>. If we now view this word, given its structural equivalence to *ari-*, *arya-* and the now evident clustering of these words round the semantic nucleus 'possession', can we dismiss as an accident the fact that it is perfectly possible to connect *kṣatrām* with the group represented by Greek *κτάσθαι*<sup>39</sup>, which has precisely the sense 'acquire'? Benveniste posits 'power' as the primary meaning of *kṣatrām*, but it is conceivable that the acknowledged meaning of *kṣā-* (Iranian *xšāy-*) 'be master of, dispose of' was merely a natural extension of a primary meaning 'possess'. This is supported by the fact that Avestan *xšaθra* means "à la fois le pouvoir et le domaine où s'exerce ce pouvoir, la royauté et le royaume". The more concrete sense of territory is also evident in the OPers. *xšāspāvan* 'satrap', lit. 'he who guards the kingdom'.

If then we may believe that *kṣatrām* was once a close synonym of *ari-* and took its place when the latter came to be used as an ethnic, this would throw an interesting light on the process of what we may call the 'repair' of a semantic structure. Such substitution of synonymous terms would preserve the semantic structure. In the extreme case, given the replacement of all the original terms, the original structure would emerge only as oppositions between homological terms.

The detection of homological structures presents the comparatist with a delicate problem which was adumbrated at the beginning of this study. Etymological work rests on the arbitrary relationship between the 'vocal' (the sound symbol) and the 'meaning'. In the case of homological structures the units compared are not sound-meaning units but purely semantic units, the essential element of arbitrariness being found in their structural siting. In the case of *captain*: *Hauptmann* the homology HEADMAN was not ascribed to chance and independent development because of the identical structural siting. The precise 'genetic' or 'historical' conclusions to be drawn from such homologies again present the comparatist with a range of possibilities. On the basis of the HEADMAN homology we should not be justified in setting up a common parent form and so ascribe to the society using this ancestral form a military command structure. The resemblance is due, of course, to cultural symbiosis. Such an explanation would have sufficed to account for the homology SHARELAND (Welsh *rhandir*, OE *gedalland*), but the addition of the Linear B evidence, supported as it is by the Hittite *takšannaš* rules out this minimal explanation. If we now add the opposition of 'man of the possession, property', and the high antiquity of the root *ar-* which underlies the various terms, then the denial of ascription to the parent language becomes more difficult.

<sup>38</sup> On the Indo-Iranian social classes see Benveniste op. cit. I, 285, II, 17ff.

<sup>39</sup> See Chantraine DELG II, 590, where he also weighs the possibility that *\*ktā-* is connected with *\*ktēi-*, which has the sense 'win from the waste, acquire'. It was this latter root which provided the Mycenaean term for the *telestās* land, *ktimenā ktoinā*. If this possibility were substantiated, then we should again have structurally sited terms not merely homologous, but actually etymologically connected to match the similar evidence for *\*kei-*. In other words, *\*ktei-*: *\*kei-* provide land-tenure terms correlating with the fundamental social opposition of warrior: cultivator.

In the attempt to set up, tentatively and programmatically, certain methodological principles for the 'genetic' assessment of homologies we may again turn to the biologists. The fundamental criterion is simply that with increasing complexity in the structural resemblances detected, the greater the probability that such homologies are to be 'genetically' explained. Further, the probability of such genetic explanation increases with the number of species exhibiting the characteristics in question. In applying these principles in his own field the comparative philologist will substitute 'related languages' for 'species'.

The striking fact on which we have to pronounce judgment is that so many Indo-European languages should exhibit this dual correlative structure in which the 'shareland' associated with the third social order is opposed to the 'possession' that is characteristic of the warrior nobles. To these nuclear resemblances we may add perhaps 'the man of the burden' as a term for those who hold land (or other benefice, e. g. live stock in the case of Ireland) in return for service. Less significance attaches perhaps to the term 'companions' for the higher nobility<sup>40</sup> with especially close relations to the king, for this is an expression which lacks the necessary element of arbitrariness.

Much further research into homologies is necessary, particularly into the vocabulary of land-tenure and social structure among non-Indo-European peoples. If it should turn out that a 'genetic' explanation of the homological structures is supported by the weight of the evidence, with the result that we are led to ascribe to the parent Indo-European society a complex system of tenurial distinctions correlated with class distinctions, this would, of course, have repercussions on the thesis that our linguistic ancestors were a predominantly pastoral people.

<sup>40</sup> On Mycenaean *e-ge-ta* see Trans. Phil. Soc. 1954 (1955) 53, Interpretation, 152; add the Anglo-Saxon *gesithas*. The same uncertainty attaches to the *temenos* of the *wanax*. In Denmark the private estate possessed by a chieftain, which was clearly separated from the village land which surrounded it, bore the significant name *ornum* 'what is taken (*num*) out (*or-*)'. L. Musset (op. cit. 88) equates the *ornum* with the Swedish *hump* or *urffjäll* and comments "... leur condition spéciale, toujours d'origine immémoriale, est signalée par des marques apparentes; elles sont en générale le bien d'un seigneur et puissant propriétaire, le roi souvent". The Irish kings, too, who exhibit traits of high antiquity (e. g. marriage with an Earth Goddess), also had an official parcel of land attached to the office. A point of interest is that they gave fiefs of livestock (information which I owe to Professor D. Binchy). On the implications of this for the history of the much discussed *feodum*, *feudum* see my Descriptive and Comparative Linguistics, 370—71.